STATE OF CONNECTICUT
CONNECTICUT SITING COUNCIL

IN RE:
APPLICATION OF NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC (AT&T) FOR A CERTIFICATE OF ENVIRONMENTAL COMPATIBILITY AND PUBLIC NEED FOR THE CONSTRUCTION, MAINTENANCE AND OPERATION OF A TELECOMMUNICATIONS TOWER FACILITY LOCATED AT 95 BALANCE ROCK ROAD IN THE TOWN OF HARTLAND, CONNECTICUT

DOCKET NO. 408

December 21, 2010

NEW CINGULAR WIRELESS PCS, LLC ("AT&T")
RESPONSES TO SITING COUNCIL INTERROGATORIES (SET ONE)

Q1. What is AT&T's minimum signal level threshold for in-building and in-vehicle use?

A1. AT&T designs for -82 dBm in-vehicle coverage and -74 dBm in-building coverage.

Q2. What is the current signal strength in the proposed service area? Does AT&T have any dropped calls/ineffective attempt statistics for the proposed service area? If so, please provide.

A2. Current signal levels range significantly in the proposed service area from -105 dBm to -70 dBm due to the terrain fluctuations. This type of spotty unreliable coverage is not acceptable for users of the AT&T network. AT&T customers are often mobile, making calls from their vehicles, their places of business and their homes. In addition, many customers are now substituting cell phones for their landline phone service as their only means of voice communications. To properly serve these customers, the service must be reliable, especially since the service will be carrying their 911 calls. Dropped calls are above system wide averages and objectives and blocking/ineffective attempts are not an issue given the low capacity environment in this area of the State. That data is considered proprietary by AT&T but is not necessarily relevant in this particular Docket because this area is known as a poor coverage area by both benchmark data and customer experience which necessitates a coverage solution. In addition, in many instances, dropped calls may not be a reliable indicator of an inadequate network for reasons such as:

- Many users become familiar with areas of poor coverage or no service and stop making calls in these areas;
- Since mobile communication is a two-way connection, if a cell site cannot hear a mobile unit, it will not register as a failure if that link is problematic; and

- Dropped calls are a partial indicator of quality - sometimes you can hold a call but the person on the other end cannot hear you.

Q3. Does AT&T intend to operate other wireless systems (PCS, LTE) besides cellular at the proposed site? If so, explain the main functions of each system and how systems interact. Provide PCS coverage plots, if applicable, using the scale and thresholds in Application Attachment 1 that depicts the following:
a) coverage from existing/approved AT&T sites; and
b) coverage from existing/approved AT&T sites and the proposed site.

A3. Yes. AT&T will deploy both cellular (850 MHz) and PCS (1900 MHZ) frequencies at the proposed facility at the outset. At this time, there is no timetable for deployment of AT&T's 700 MHz frequencies at the site. These frequencies area all intended for use to provide services to customers. Currently, AT&T supports GSM, UMTS, HSPA and is migrating to LTE. The 850 MHz frequency band is the primary driver in network design and deployment needs.

PCS (1900 MHz) coverage plots are included in Exhibit A.

Q4. Identify the amount of cellular and PCS coverage (square miles) provided by the proposed site.

A4. The amount of cellular and PCS coverage in square miles provided by the proposed site includes:

Coverage Area (sq. mi.)		
	Cellular (850 MHz)	PCS(1900 MHz)
In-Vehicle	17.13	10.73
In-Building	10.20	6.26

Q5. Please provide a copy of AT&T's Power Density Report, dated June 10, 2010.

A5. The Power Density Report, dated June 10, 2010, is attached as Exhibit B.

Q6. Approximately when did AT&T establish a search ring for the site? Did the search area shift over time to account for changes in technology or the development of adjacent sites? Approximately when did AT&T begin discussion with the town regarding the proposed search area?

A6. AT&T issued a search ring for this area in December of 2008. Available sites within the search ring were significantly limited given that the area within the search ring is dominated by the Tunxis State Park and Barkhamsted Reservoir watershed lands of the MDC. As such, properties outside of the search ring were also investigated for the siting of the needed facility. These investigations resulted in the proposed site. AT&T began discussions with the Town with the submission of its Technical Report.

Q7. Provide separate coverage plots, using the scale and thresholds in Application Attachment 1 that depicts coverage from the existing AT&T sites and the proposed site at antenna heights of 170 feet and 150 feet.

A7. The requested plots are included in Exhibit C.

Q8. Is it possible to develop an alternative tower site in the northeastern portion of the parcel? If not, why not? If yes, provide a diagram that depicts the layout of an access road and compound location.

A8. Yes. AT&T has investigated an alternative tower site approximately 500' to the northeast of the proposed location on the same parcel. Enclosed in Exhibit D is a drawing detailing an alternate location for the proposed Facility on the Ring Mountain Hunt Club property.

Q9. Referring to the Site Search Summary (Application Attachment 2), what tower heights were examined for properties # 2, 4, and 8? Provide a coverage plot (cellular) from each of these properties at the heights examined.

A9. A tower height of 190' AGL was reviewed for the properties listed as numbers 2, 4, and 8 in the Site Search Summary included in Attachment 2 of AT&T's Application.

Coverage maps for each of these sites are included in Exhibit E. As noted in the Site Search Summary, the property listed as number 8 includes an approximately 1,883 acre parcel on which the DEP garage is located. A location in the vicinity of the DEP garage was analyzed and is shown in the attached coverage map. Also, this location is state forest property and as such, is unavailable for the siting of a tower facility.

Q10. Referring to the Site Search Summary, did Property #3 meet coverage objectives? If so, at what height?

A10. No. The property listed as number 3 in AT&T's Site Search Summary did not meet the coverage objectives along Route 20 near the northern part of the Barkhamsted Reservoir. This alternative was analyzed at a height of 190' AGL.

As shown in the 3D Terrain Map provided in Exhibit F, the topography in this area is characterized by significant changes in elevation, which the ability of a site to provide adequate service.

Q11. Provide the appropriate legal reference that excludes Class I & II watershed lands from tower development. Did AT&T contact the Metropolitan District Commission regarding the potential availability of non-Class I & II watershed properties in the area?

A11. Connecticut General Statutes (CGS) Sections 25-32(b)(c)(d)& (e).

Correspondence on behalf of AT&T was sent to the MDC requesting information on any MDC properties in the area that may be Class III and possibly available for lease. A copy of this correspondence is included in Exhibit G.

Q12. Does the church steeple located at 100 Granville Road in Hartland accommodate any telecommunication providers, including AT&T? If so, what carriers are located here?

A12. AT&T does not operate a wireless facility at the church located at 100 Granville Road. AT&T has no knowledge of any other carriers with facilities at this location.

Q13. What were the specific requests of the Planning and Zoning Commission that resulted from the August 16, 2010 Public Information Meeting?

A13. The Planning & Zoning Commission requested that the equipment compound fence include privacy slats, which AT&T has incorporated into its facility design. The location of the tower on the site was also discussed with the Planning & Zoning Commission and as a result, AT&T relocated the tower approximately 110' to the north so that the tower radius lies substantially within the property boundaries.

Subsequent to the August 16th Planning & Zoning Commission information meeting and post Application filing, AT&T and its representatives arranged site visits at the request of the Hartland Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission. On November 8th and 9th, members of the Hartland Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission conducted field visits with AT&T's wetlands consultant, Dean Gustafson, senior wetlands scientist with Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. (VHB) and AT&T's Site Acquisition consultant, David Vivian. Also in attendance at the November 8th site visit was Sean Hayes, certified soil scientist with the Northwest Conservation District. The Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission requested that Mr. Hayes attend the field visits to provide an independent review of AT&T's wetlands delineation.

Subsequent to these field reviews, on December 2nd, AT&T participated in a community meeting before the Hartland Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission to provide the community with another opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the wetlands and the proposed Facility from AT&T's consultants. At this meeting, correspondence from the Northwest Conservation District was reviewed and as noted therein, the Northwest Conservation District confirmed that AT&T's wetlands delineations contained in its Siting Council Application were accurate.

In addition, after the 12/2 community meeting, AT&T's representatives responded to questions from the Town and community regarding existing sites in Granville, Massachusetts and suggested alternative areas.

Q14. In Application Attachment 4, the visibility summary states year-round views would be limited to distant locations, totaling 1.9-acres. Is this statement accurate? What is the acreage of near-views from the two properties immediately south of the site?

A14. The 1.9 acres is the total area within the study radius that will have year round views. The total 1.9 acres can be broken down as follows: 0.79 acres will be more distant, 0.60 acres will be in closer proximity to the tower (two abutting properties immediately to the south; based on computer modeling), and 0.51 acres will have closer views of the tower on the host parcel.

Q15. Would AT&T's proposed facility comply with recommended United States Fish and Wildlife Service guidelines for minimizing potential impacts to bird species? Please explain.

A15. Yes. The structure is less than 200' in height, does not require FAA lighting and has no guyed wires. A December 15, 2010 memorandum prepared by Vanasse Hangen Brustlin, Inc. ("VHB memorandum") reviewing the proposed Facility's compliance with recommended U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service guidelines is attached as Exhibit H.

Q16. In Application Attachment 6, the NT Submission Packet contains a Public Notice concerning a facility in Cornwall. Was one prepared and submitted to a newspaper for this site? If so, please provide. Is such notice required by the Federal Communications Commission?

A16. A Public Notice was prepared and published on November 3, 2009 for the proposed Hartland site. A copy of this notice for AT&T's Hartland Facility is provided in Exhibit I. This notice is required pursuant to the rules implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Nationwide Programmatic Agreement for Review of Effects on Historic Properties for Certain Undertakings approved by the Federal Communications Commission.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this day, a copy of the foregoing was sent electronically and the original and twenty (20) copies were sent by overnight mail to the Connecticut Siting Council with copy to:

David F. Sherwood, Esq.
Moriarty, Paetzold & Sherwood
2230 Main Street, P.O. Box 1420
Glastonbury, CT 06033-6620
(860) 657-1010
(860) 657-1011 fax
dfsherwood@gmail.com

Dated: December 21, 2010

Lucia Chiocchio

cc: Michele Briggs, AT&T
David Vivian, SAI
Anthony Wells, C Squared
Scott Pollister, C Squared
Dean Gustafson, VHB
Michael Libertine, VHB
Christopher B. Fisher, Esq.